UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Economics and Ethics

By HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY

Soviet Rulers on Vacation

By ANNA LOUISE STRONG

Humanism—A Statement

By CHARLES FRANCIS POTTER

VOLUME CV NUMBER 2

Chicago, March 10, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Horace Lo. Jones, Jacksonville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthèeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

Five Articles on Russia

by

Anna Louise Strong

Miss Strong has lived in Russia for a large part of every year since the Revolution in 1917. She has traveled in every part of the country, and has crossed Siberia and China. She knows all the leaders of the Soviet Republic and is in intimate touch with all political and social movements. These articles are written from Russia where she is now residing.

The subjects of this special series of articles are as follows:

The Fighting Farmers of Russia.
The Year of the Great "Break-Over" in Russia.
Soviet Rulers on Vacation.
Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies.
Moving Out from the Ranks in Russia, or Raising Up Managers.

These five articles will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for February 24.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 19
Economics and Ethics—HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY 21
Jottings—J. H. H. 22

ARTICLES—

Homeward—*Joseph Fort Newton* 19
Soviet Rulers on Vacation—ANNA LOUISE STRONG 23
Gandhi on the Lahore Congress—*M. K. Gandhi* 25
Humanism—A Statement—CHARLES FRANCIS POTTER 27

THE STUDY TABLE—

Whither Mankind—MAYNARD SHIPLEY 29
Significant Anthologies—LUCIA TRENT 29

CORRESPONDENCE—

A Friend With a Mind of Her Own—AGNES C. WATSON 30
India, Britain and the Present Crisis—DALJIT SINGH SADHARIA 31
Correction and Explanation—SHERWOOD EDDY.. 31

THE FIELD—

National Federation of Religious Liberals at Rockford 31
American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation 32

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1930 NUMBER 2

HOMEWARD

Why did Shakespeare sell his holdings in London and go back to Stratford? For one thing, he was wise enough to know when to quit; but other ties tugged at his heart—a love of mother earth, and memories of old scenes. Why did Ibsen, as the end drew near, leave sunny Italy and return to his sea-washed northern land? Was it an intuition, or genius, of place, a homing instinct of the soul which longs to leave the earth near where it entered it? The little fish in the silver pool in the hills senses a hint of winter in the air, and betakes himself to deeper waters. Amid the feathery gold of falling maple leaves, the bird packs his baggage and goes south, following a viewless path. The soul, too, has its deep and delicate instincts, and in the gloaming of life "turns again home."

—Joseph Fort Newton.

Thank heaven the month of February is gone, and with it the Lincoln and Washington birthday celebrations. Year by year these seem to get worse. Christmas, in spite of its commercialization, still preserves a noble spirit; the 4th of July betrays some signs of sanity. But February 12th and 22nd are still as foolishly inane and nauseatingly sentimental as ever. All the stupid myths and legends, the patriotic platitudes and pious piffles, are trotted out like ancient firehorses and made once again to go through their tricks. It is surprising that this should be so. An amazing amount of work has been done in recent years by historians and biographers to expose the lies and restore the truth about these two great figures in the Pantheon of American fame and honor. Sandburg and Beveridge, to name only two, have told us the facts about the real Lincoln. Rupert Hughes, to name only one, has given us a "true George Washington" such as Paul Leicester Ford never dreamed of. Yet the old yarns live on! It makes one despair of truth, and of the people. Obviously a democracy must have its idols, and the common heart is not satisfied until it prostrates itself before its demi-gods. We are still barbarians, preserving the prejudices, maintaining the habits, and hugging the superstitions of our ancestors. Thus, there must be an American mythology to take the place of the old Jewish and Christian mythologies of our religion. In saying this, perhaps, we have hit upon the real reason why Washington and Lincoln are lifted so high, and patriotism become a cult which has its altars and sacrifices and devotions. For ours is the first generation which has found itself stripped of its old comforting beliefs in God the Creator, Jesus the Savior, the Bible the Holy Book, Adam our first progenitor, and all the rest. To fill the void left in our lives by these crumbling faiths, we now have a new faith in which Washington and Lincoln are the first two persons of the American Trinity. Well, it's all a part of human nature. And we may be comforted in the thought that what has happened to the Christian myths must sooner or later happen to the American as well.

We wonder if the defeat of Tardieu in France was carefully arranged by the Prime Minister himself! Certainly in the present confusion into which the London Naval Conference has fallen, nothing could be more welcome to Tardieu than forced retirement from the field. He has stated the will of France in the matter of armaments in no uncertain terms, and thus stirred anew the nationalistic spirit of the French people and defied the hopes of Britain and the United States. Now he can retire with honors, leaving to his unhappy successor the thankless task of "carrying on" in London until the Conference either breaks up in disaster or else drifts gently away into futility. A fortnight ago we stated in these columns that we were optimistic about the London Conference, largely because of our abiding confidence in MacDonald on the one hand and Hoover on the other. Now we have to confess that the sheer force of events has sadly shaken our confidence and that we are beginning to feel immeasurably discouraged at the outlook. We realize that it is dangerous to say this at this time when another two weeks (when this editorial will be printed) may change the situation to the good as the last two or three weeks have changed it to the bad. But we cannot conceal our feeling that Tardieu retired at the moment when retirement was a healthy thing, and we can well imagine Grandi, Stimson, and even MacDonald envying the happy lot of the French Premier. The successor to Tardieu, M. Chautemps is an unknown quantity, and therefore just the kind of amiable nonentity to be useful at this time. We hope for him the best, and fear for him the worst.

Nothing is more thrilling in the present crisis in India than Gandhi's unshakable adherence to the non-violent, non-resistant method of revolution, unless it be the touching devotion of the Indian people themselves in support of the Mahatma and his ideals. A fortnight ago Gandhi was elected Dictator of the Indian National

Congress, and thus personally entrusted with the complete control of the movement of civil disobedience, which he may now guide and regulate without any further approval of the Congress Executive. It is on this basis of civil disobedience and not of violence in any form that the great revolution for national independence in India is to go forward. A recent statement reveals the clearness of Gandhi's mind and the exalted heroism of his heart. He recognizes with the utmost clarity the existence in India of forces of violence, and the likelihood that these forces will be released. He knows that the Government, determined to suppress civil disobedience by all means at its disposal, will not hesitate to draw the sword. He knows also that there are Communist and other small groups of agitators among the Indian people who will gladly answer violence with violence.

> The Government, (says the Mahatma) will spread out red paws in what it will call self-defense. The party of violence may commit the mistake of coming out in the open. The non-violent party must then prove its creed, if necessary, by being ground to powder between two millstones. My hopes and plans are built upon an ever-increasing faith in the existence of this party of true non-violence. From whatever quarter it (violence) comes, freedom's battle must continue until not a single representative is alive.

Here is no uncompromising declaration of the policy of turning the other cheek, of resisting not evil, of dying rather than killing. To Gandhi non-violence is dearer and more fundamentally binding than even the determination to wrest freedom from stubborn hands. Mankind has never seen so sublime a leader as this, or so sublime a cause. This present hour constitutes in more ways than one the climatic moment of spiritual history.

They had a nice little party out in Arizona the other day. The occasion was the hanging of Mrs. Eva Dugan, a fifty-two year old woman, mother of two children. Accused of murder, and duly tried and convicted, Mrs. Dugan stoutly denied the truth of evidence which was purely circumstantial. But she had to die by hanging from the neck until she was dead. This wasn't long in her case, as her neck was weak, and when the rope snapped after the drop of the trap-door, it completely severed her head from her body. The doctors declared that, since the victim's head was torn right off, she died instantaneously and without pain. Which may be so! But the Chinese have a better and cleaner way of accomplishing decapitation. Instead of taking a rough rope and tearing the head from the trunk, they take a sharp sword and cut it off in one neat stroke. We should prefer, we think, to die at the hands of Chinese rather than at the hands of Americans. Arizona seems to set a good deal of store by her executions. She is proud of them and wants to remember them. Thus, in the execution-chamber where Mrs. Dugan was decapitated, the walls are hung with the pictures of sixteen persons, all men, who have been hanged on this same gallows. Around each picture, as a kind of decorative festoon, is the noose which caused the death. The newspapers said nothing about it, but we imagine that school children and church folk are taken periodically to this art gallery, to see the pleasant faces, and to ponder prayerfully the justice and mercy of the state. The warden, on this happy occasion of one more addition to the pictures, seems to have been sort of weak-kneed and white-livered. Twice, on the night before the execution, he said, he rolled from his bed in night-mares. Arizona he-men ought to do better than that. The chaplain, Rev. Walter Huffman, did do better. Solemnly before the bloody rite began, he said to the twenty-five witnesses present, "Now please take a good look and see what capital punishment does." Yes, take a good look! Pick up that severed head, and that bleeding trunk! And may *God save the state.*

Next September, in Dayton, Tennessee, in the same building where John T. Scopes taught his biology class the doctrine of evolution and thus precipitated the so-called "monkey trial" that convulsed the world, the Bryan Memorial University will open for its first term. Its location in the old building of the Central High School, pending the erection of its own building on the eighty-acre campus acquired for the new institution, is accidental and temporary. But it has a dramatic fitness, as does the planting of the University in Dayton itself, for the scene is central in the career of the late William J. Bryan. Here it was, in the famous trial, that Mr. Bryan laid down his life in the great battle of the Bible against science, for there can be no doubt that it was the excitements and aggravations of that occasion in the torrid heat of summer, which led to his sudden death. It was in this trial also that the logic of Mr. Bryan's whole career came to its inevitable climax of disclosure. All that Mr. Bryan had been for thirty years was here made manifest. The ignorance, the shallowness, the intellectual poverty of the man were mercilessly displayed, as well as his almost pitiful sincerity and courage for his cause. When posterity seeks to know the "Peerless Leader" in terms of understanding, it will turn to this last chapter of the story as the perfect revelation. And the revelation is not yet ended! According to the President of the University, Mr. F. E. Robinson, $5,000,000 is now being raised to build and endow the institution; and a faculty is being gathered, every member of which "will have affirmed his belief that the Bible is infallibly true." Here is William J. Bryan alive in the spirit! Could there be any more amazing phenomenon in this late age of enlightenment and learning?

Is Will Rogers losing his soul, and with his soul his vision? Disquieting signs are multiplying that he is losing touch with those great and fundamental instincts

of the human heart which have hitherto been to him, as the earth to Antaeus, his source of strength. What are we to say, for example, to his comments on the London Naval Conference—not only his cynicism as to the seriousness and significance of the whole performance, which may be excusable, but his frank belief in a large navy, and his hostility, therefore, to disarmament? Will Rogers lined up with the militarists and the Security Leaguers and the D. A. R.'s is a curious and rather pathetic spectacle. Worse still were his remarks about the fight of Norris and Borah and LaFollette and the rest of the gallant twenty-six against the nomination of Charles Evans Hughes to the Supreme Bench. In this contest Rogers could see nothing but "wild jackasses" on a rampage, and was actually so obtuse as to suggest that it came to an end after four furious days because of popular pressure upon revolting senators. This does not sound like the discerning, discriminating, keen-eyed, plain-spoken jester who has adorned the court of our free democracy in recent years. It is to be noted that Will Rogers is becoming prosperous. He is an honored guest in great houses, and moves in the best society. He is a friend of politicians and bankers. He writes for the New York *Times*. Does he see things as he used to see them? Hardly! Few men can resist this contagion. Will Rogers is getting dull in wit, as he is getting fat in body. Prosperity, popularity and power are doing their appointed work. What a pity!

Economics and Ethics

It is a sign of hope in the social sciences that some students, at least, are ceasing to suffer from the ultra-scientific attitude that has cursed those sciences during the past generation. People have pleased themselves by imagining that they were going to attain purely scientific results in these fields, aside from all questions of social action, apart from all desire to do anything. The notion was stultifying and humanly unsound. None the less it has high scientific support, and the human sciences in many cases have become less and less humanistic. The good old science of political economy, perhaps badly named, did yet by its very title concern itself with the *polis*, it did have a political implication, it carried with it the suggestion of something that was going to be done or at least that might be done. Then during the latter part of the nineteenth century it dropped off the first half of its title, it became more "scientific" and lost in the thought of its devotees something of its practical significance, something of its instrumental value. Professing itself a social science, it yet suffered from the danger of becoming unduly a science of wealth, not of welfare.

Happily there is occurring now something of a reaction among economists, or perhaps more properly speaking there is a cleavage in the economic ranks. On the one hand, a great body of business economists is splitting off, men who more and more serve mammon in enlightened fashion and on the whole make mammon a somewhat more enlightened master. They have no particular importance; for they accept the current business scheme essentially as it is, studying only how to make it work a little more smoothly here and a little more profitably there. But they provide no fundamental or thorough-going criticism, and on the whole they serve the dominant business group well by supplying them with a certain amount of quasi-respectable intellectual furniture. It is to this task that the university schools of business, that plague of contemporary academic life, have devoted themselves. Generally speaking they are earning their living by what they are doing for those who put up the funds.

But there is another group, fortunately, who have made no such compromise and surrender. Insisting on scientific integrity and scientific detachment, they have yet come to see with increasing clearness that no fruitful science of economics can exist apart from the great ethical and political questions that suggest its problems and indicate the lines of its investigations. They have recognized that economics in reality is only a branch of ethics, that it investigates the laws of human behavior in relation to wealth in order to help men do better the great task of living together. They see, in other words, that the only economics worth a man's time is a humanist economics, that the only values worth studying are values for human life. As a result, we are getting some studies that are genuinely and valuably critical, because they take the existing economic scheme and try to evaluate it, not from the standpoint of its effectiveness as a means of piling up wealth, but from the point of view of its excellence as a means for creating a better human life. Such an economics is by no means necessarily altogether hostile to your existing system of capitalism. In fact, it may estimate certain features of that system very highly. But it does require every feature of the system to come before the bar of judgment as to whether it does or does not make for a richer and fuller life.

Conspicuous among this humanist group for a generation has stood the eminent British economist John A. Hobson, combining with keenness of intellect and breadth of knowledge a depth of understanding and an unfailing sympathy that necessarily directed his work to the question of human well-being. In his latest book, "Economics and Ethics" (D. C. Heath and Company), Mr. Hobson has produced a study in social values that will command the thoughtful attention of every real student, for it constitutes the first serious attempt in the English language to trace out systematically the proper

place of economics in the general ethical scheme and to apply ethical principles to the evaluation of current economic ideas and practices in such a way that ethics and economics may mutually reinforce each other.

"The art of human welfare in its full relation to the population of the earth and the civilization of the future," says Mr. Hobson, is the chief duty of man. "The highest value attaches to the conduct and the motives which sustain society in the elaborate structure it has attained, and assist it to further useful modes of cooperation." The social emphasis is obvious. Welfare is organic well-being, and depends at once on the innate equipment of the human animal and on the complex of ideas and institutions that bind him in the community. Hence, given native equipment, which itself may conceivably be more or less modified by common action affecting the quality of population, welfare is conditioned on community arrangements, among which economic arrangements of course are highly important.

Judged by this welfare standard, economic institutions and practices often appear in a new light. The absolute character of property rights, of course, disappears. Recognizing the social character of wealth creation, we come to think, not how much the community may take away from the individual, but how much the community will allow the individual to retain. There is no basis of right except the social consequences of this or that course of action, and the social consequences that we shall consider are the effects on human welfare as we have defined it. How revolutionary might be the results if some such conception of rights as this were to be accepted and acted on by the justices of our Supreme Court! Property, instead of being a fixed and unchangeable obstruction in the way of human progress, becomes a flexible and constantly changing category, of the utmost service in the endless community task of increasing well-being. As Mr. Hobson indicates, the newer understanding is resulting already, partly in a limited communism, as in education, recreation and insurance, for example, and partly in a piecemeal socialism such as we see before our eyes every day in a multitude of government activities. The old hard and fast antithesis between individualism and socialism simply disappears in the light of such conceptions, and we find ourselves choosing courses of action more or less in disregard of these catchwords. Of course, the areas of practically unfettered individual action are more and more limited, because community control becomes increasingly necessary in the promotion of welfare.

Turn again to the fundamental distinction, on which Mr. Hobson has laid emphasis in earlier works, between costs, those payments which are necessary to call forth economic activity, and surpluses, which embrace payments, like ground rents, for example, that are not thus necessary. On the basis of a human valuation, we shall move without hesitation in the direction of taking surpluses by taxation or otherwise for the common purposes of the community, as a saving fund to improve productive capacity by increase of capital and education of the human agent, and to enrich directly the life of the community as a whole and of its constitutent members by supplying those non-economic services upon which so much of the richness of living depends.

As we begin to bring our economic system within range of our ethical thinking in terms of such an ideal as Mr. Hobson defines, we necessarily lose our preoccupation with production. Many things we shall not make at all, because however profitable their production their human costs are too great. But more than that, distribution takes on fresh importance. All claims to income lose force except those which can justify themselves on the ground that they mean a net addition to well-being. But back of all this lies the study of consumption, and economics cannot make its highest contribution to welfare except as it pushes its studies back to the point where it shows how far the desired things, those which make the economic machine go, really correspond with the desirable ones, those which make us better men and women. If it be maintained that that is the task of ethics and not of economics, a humanist like Mr. Hobson would reply, and reply rightly, that the two disciplines must here work in cooperation, and that economics performs its task only partially so long as it does not accept its responsibility to the full. If scientists want to study electrons let them do so, but if they want to study men, let them remember that at the last they must study men as human beings.

HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY.

Jottings

There was a time when we were regarded as a heretic because we believed so little. We seem today to be regarded as a heretic because we believe so much.

At last an automobilist has fulfilled his ambition. He has derailed a train at a grade crossing. What a pity that the automobilist did not live to enjoy his heroic achievement—which, incidentally, cost only 11 dead and 100 injured!

There are limitations to what the law can do, after all. Congress may vote to make the "Star Spangled Banner" legally our national anthem, as is now proposed, but the music of that curious song will still remain unsingable and its words indecent.

It is when we receive letters from Russia that the refusal of the United States to recognize the Soviets seems most ridiculous. These letters come from a

country which does not exist officially, yet all the vast machinery of the American government is used to deliver an envelope stamped with the face of Lenin.

Who knows the name of the man who invented the process of extracting sugar from beets? This man died a fortnight ago, and was given an inside two-inch obituary in the newspapers. Yet he probably had a larger influence upon the political and economic history of this country than many men whose names are household words.

By the time the British Labor Party gets to India it looks to the Indians just like the Tories. And it seems to act just like them, too.

J. H. H.

Soviet Rulers on Vacation

I have been spending three weeks at Sochi, one of the chief health resorts in Russia, the one to which Trotsky used to go for his stomach ailments, and where, incidentally, at the present moment, Stalin and Kalenin, (the secretary of the Party and the president of the Government) are both resting, taking the Matsesta baths. These are medicinal baths of sulphur and hydrogen and other chemicals. They are said to be many times as strong as any of the famous "baths" of Germany and Austria.

Sochi itself is beautifully placed where the green foot-hills of the Caucasus come steeply down to the Black Sea. Along its shores before the war arose villas of Petersburg merchants and businessmen and officials, each with spacious grounds more luxurious than the houses, for Sochi climate tempts to a life in the open air. By climbing the trails to the hill-tops behind these villas, one gets a view on a clear day of snow-peaks; by dropping a hundred feet or so below the villas, one comes to a sun-baked beach, rather too pebbly for comfort but as good as any beach which the inland seas of Russia furnish.

The villas, which during the war were shelled by a German gun-boat making a "demonstration" along this coast, have been repaired in the past few years by various departments of the soviet government, and serve as sanatoriums and rest-houses for its workers and officials. A little down the road, for instance, is the House of the Journalists, where all persons employed in newspaper production are entitled to come for a rest on paying the sum of 115 roubles a month; it has a waiting-list and is very crowded, housing as many as eight persons in the larger rooms. Beyond the journalists one comes to the rest-houses of two different railroads, the Moscow-Baltic, and the Moscow-Northern, run by their respective departments of Social Insurance for the railway workers to whom the doctor prescribes Matsesta baths. Still further on, almost over-looking the baths themselves, but high on a hill to avoid the heavy sulphur smells, is the pride of Sochi and of all visiting communists, the new "hotel-sanatorium" erected a few months ago, housing 350 persons, and giving single rooms to as many as sixty. It is a stupendous building of concrete and glass, five stories high, with a great circular dining-room on each floor facing the sea, and with many covered pergolas and the beginnings of a fine garden. Every room has a private sun-porch, and there is also solarium on the roof, with men's and women's sections, where one can take a cold shower following on the hot-sun. Such is the demand for places in Sochi that another mammoth sanatorium-hotel, not far from the first, is already under construction.

At none of these mentioned houses is to be found the real elite of Russia's social structure. They are at the sanatorium where I am taking my meals, and at another one half a kilometer away. These are maintained by funds of the Communist Party and are used for "responsible workers" which means the more important persons in high state and party positions, who need a rest and a "cure" and are sent here at party expense. Not even their wives are allowed to live at the sanatorium, unless they also are important communists recommended by the Medical Commission of the party. If other wives come, as they do in considerable numbers, they take private rooms in small houses formerly belonging to servants, and get their meals at the sanatorium unless it is crowded, in which case they must hunt their own food. As a guest of one of these wives, presenting also my own letters of introduction, I was permitted to dine at the sanatorium.

There are present such persons as these: the head of the Foreign Department of the State Bank, a mighty institution with hundreds of branches throughout the country, and correspondents in practically every foreign land; the director of capital construction for all the war industries; the vice-president of a large province not far from Moscow; one of the heads of the Communist Control Commission of the Ukraine; a woman who is on the editorial board of the Isvesta, the official government newspaper and who writes standard works on economics; another woman who is high in the State Planning Board, in control of all budgeting for the growth of Cooperatives, and her husband, formerly president of the Printers Union and now manager of a big printing trust. There is here the general manager of the State Grain Trust, which owns 95% of all the grain elevators and commercial flour-mills in Russia and handles the grain distribution to the cities.

Obviously here is a cross-section of the upper group who rule Russia, and who have risen to power by a series of tests more severe than have faced the rulers of any other land. Those who are here have shared prison and underground revolutionary work for many years.

They are perhaps the most exclusive high society in the world, to which neither wealth nor birth nor brains can buy admission, but only a long past shared faithfully together. They can be very affable to foreigners, as persons whose own position is fixed beyond changing; but they are confidential only among their own numbers. They marry, also, chiefly among their own.

Yet in the easy leisure of the sanatorium one achieves a semi-confidence which years of meeting in Moscow could not give. I thus learn quite new per-

sonal facts about a man I have known for many years. How as a boy of eighteen taking part in the 1905 revolt, he was beaten up in jail with the intention that the beating should kill him of internal injuries in a couple of weeks. "The jail doctor said I might last for a month, but not longer; but I survived, as you see, to this day. Only those of four places in my lungs which were smashed and from which I long had hemorrhages—they bother me today whenever I am ill." . . . He told me further how, an unformed revolutionary youth, he had met in the jail older revolutionists of all varieties, and listened to long debates between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, "thus completing my revolutionary education and joining the Bolsheviks."

A charming and efficient woman of thirty-five, who holds a high post in Moscow, told me of her early jail experiences at eighteen, thrust into an ancient dungeon built by Catherine the Great, and so damp that "for the whole year, day and night, we never took off our winter clothes and felt boots. The four women in my cell all had tuberculosis when we came out. None the less I recovered."

Persons like these now hold positions of power, both political and economic, which in any other land would mean wealth; in any other land, when they came to sanatoria, they could count on the utmost luxury available. How do they live in Sochi?

These highly placed officials cannot even count on private rooms, which they can share alone with their wives. The men are four in a room, and so are those women who have attained the right of residence in the sanatorium. This villa, which once housed only the owner of a Petersburg journal and his guests, now houses twenty-six important communists, whose health is considered of value to the state. Only one man, the head of the Grain Trust, who has been here longest, has thereby managed to secure for himself and his wife the one small room which is reserved for two persons.

This lack of privacy is the more severe, as most of the wives here present are women of such public importance that they are away from their husbands most of the year on business of state. The old ties formed in the prewar days are still strong, and during their month of rest they want to be together. "It wasn't so bad," said one, "when the days were bright, and you could take long walks in the park or on the beach with your husband; but now that it is rainy, and you are shut up with three women and he with three men—the situation gets nervous." Such are the deprivations in this sanatorium of the highest officials. But there was, to an outsider, little sign of this nervousness. The relations between husbands and wives seemed unusually charming, perhaps because they never in their busy lives, got enough of each other.

The men wear chiefly the sanatorium suit of baggy grayish linen, in shape not unlike pajamas, and with blouse usually open at the throat. During the hot hours they often are clad only in bathing bloomers, as short as the usual bathing trunks, but fuller. The women, as everywhere, feel obliged to wear more than this; their chief dress is the sarafan. This is a local costume, with short full skirt, partly-fitted bodice and shoulder straps. It is very low, exposing much of the back and chest and all of the arms to the browning effects of the sun, and there is some competition as to who can acquire, all over her body, the deepest shade of tan. Stockings are worn only when it is cold; in the sun, one at once removes them.

During the sunny hours, also, the beaches are lined with both men and women, taking sun-baths and sea-baths. No one wears any bathing costume, unless they go to a public beach in Sochi. But the men and women bathe and take their sun bath in different spots of the beach. On approaching the beach, one sends a glance up and down to see where there is a free spot or a place occupied only by members of one's own sex. Here also there is convention. A man may pass without offense within a hundred feet or so of the spot where unclothed women are bathing and sunning themselves; but if he ventured nearer or remained to stare, he would be ostracized by everyone thereafter. The only exception to this is that a husband and wife, sometimes accompanied by a child, are often seen bathing together. To tell the truth, this unclothed bathing, far from being piquant, is very dull. There is none of the joyous shouting and water-sport with numbers, which accompanies mixed bathing. One enters the sea for the number of minutes prescribed by the doctor, and then comes out, feeling more or less bored.

There are other conventions quite well defined, in this society which has broken all the world's conventions. One of these is the convention which protects the vacation time of important persons. Any American editor will wonder, no doubt, why I make no attempt to interview Stalin during his vacation, and do not even ask at what villa he is living. This is one of the things that "isn't done." Stalin's arrival was mentioned in no newspaper; no such arrivals are "news" in Russia. No one thinks of visiting him on business unless the business is so important that it justifies the extremest breach of decorum. I have seen his auto pass me twice coming from the baths of Matsesta, but I know that if I were even to attempt to talk with him, I should lose all standing in Russia as a crude person of no perceptions, who had selfishly tried to take away an important person's chance of rest. . . . The hounding of Lindbergh's honeymoon would seem incredible to a Russian.

Even with the lesser lights of our sanatorium I seldom venture to ask questions about their labors. Rather, we play dominoes, or alma, the games most popular among the lighter souls. The serious ones play chess, doing it so well that I never venture to contest them. The pack of playing-cards, which I brought from my bag, created a mild sensation of joy among the wives, and one or two of the men joined them in playing; but most of the elder communists do not play cards "on principle" as they politely inform you.

They do much reading, most of it non-fiction, in an effort to keep up with public events outside their department. Even the fiction is "problem" stuff, studies in the social structure of the Argentine, or Sinclair Lewis' novels about America, or Russian novels about phases of the revolution. The utterly frivolous type of restful tale, such as the detective yarns with which Woodrow Wilson and lesser beings like myself, refresh ourselves after our labors—do not exist here. . . . Such is the simple life of the communist upper circles on the bathing beach of Sochi. The high light in the whole month was an automobile excursion to the neighboring town of Gagri, where we investigated the sanatoriums of various institutions and strolled on another beach just like our own where we drank bottles of local wine in an open-air restaurant.

ANNA LOUISE STRONG.

Gandhi on the Lahore Congress

[Reports of the Labore Congress in India have been confused and confusing. Even statements by eye-witnesses in these columns have been unsatisfactory as expressing necessarily the views of outsiders. One man only can tell what really took place in this meeting of such enormous significance to India, England and the world, and that man is Gandhi. Here is his account as printed in *Young India*.—Editor.]

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru more than justified the people's choice for President. His address brief and to the point was bold, extreme in conception but moderate in expression. It bore evidence of a man capable of viewing things with complete detachment. A confirmed socialist, he wants for his country what only the country can manage. He is a practical statesman tempering his ideals to suit his surroundings. But for himself he is an idealist who would ever strive to live up to his ideals.

As in his address, so in the chair. He was strong, yet accommodating. His wit came to his rescue on many an awkward occasion. He never hesitated when action was required. His tireless energy and entire self-forgetfulness, his natural simplicity and affability captivated every one. No Government that is at all anxious to do what is right can have any reason to fear Jawaharlal Nehru. A wicked Government would soon feel the strength of a stalwart who counts no price too dear to pay for ridding the country of wicked rule.

The youth of the country has every reason to be proud of their representative, the nation may well rejoice to find in Jawaharlal Nehru such a noble and worthy son. May God's blessings descend upon him and may the nation reach her destination during Jawaharlal's year of service.

The resolutions of the Congress strictly followed the trend of the presidential address. Let us first consider the central resolution. In strict accordance with the Calcutta resolution and owing to a combination of circumstances undesigned by anybody, Dominion Status gave place at the stroke of midnight 31st, December, 1929, to complete Independence as the immediate objective of the Congress. Swaraj in article I of the Congress constitution is now to mean complete Independence. It is as well. Apart from the Calcutta resolution, Mr. Benn's statement that India already had Dominion Status in action made that phrase impossible of acceptance to convey the nation's meaning. If representation, at important functions, of India through representatives chosen by the British Government, means Dominion Status in action, Heaven help India. The Congress means something totally different from it. For the Congress, Dominion Status meant complete independence plus voluntary partnership with Britain as it might be with any other nation for mutual good. Lastly it has been of late loudly whispered that Independence was illegal, and a resolution replacing Dominion Status with Independence would mean the death of the Congress. This threat made it a sacred obligation for the Congress to incorporate complete Independence in the Congress creed. The Congress would not be worthy to represent the nation, if for fear of consequences, it hesitated to enunciate the nation's birthright. If Swaraj was a doubtful word, it becomes unequivocal by becoming Purna Swaraj.

But the Congress rejected by an overwhelming majority any change in the description of the means. They still remain "peaceful and legitimate." There were members in the Subjects Committee who suggested that independence would not be vindicated by non-violent and truthful means. Violence there undoubtedly was in the air. But I feel that those who flock to the Congress session year by year have a living faith in non-violence as the only possible means for India at least to regain her lost freedom. Non-violence and truth are the vital need for India if the stupor of the millions is to be removed, if the warring communities are to be welded into one. A foreign power must be a necessary factor for any community that will coerce any other or the others into submission to its will. But the Congress must perforce remain non-violent if it will represent, as it claims to represent, all communities. Whether therefore it takes a year or ages to reach political independence, non-violence and truth are in my opinion the shortest way to it. Complete Independence of the Congress is no menace to a single legitimate foreign interest or the presence of a single Englishman who will live as a friend willing to submit to the rules applicable to the whole of Independent India.

This is clear from the condemnation of the bomb resolution and the clause in the central resolution appreciating the efforts of the Viceroy to arrive at a peaceful solution of the national problem. Both the bomb resolution and the clause were hotly contested, but the Congress accepted both, the one by a substantial majority ascertained after a division and the second by an overwhelming majority. I am sure that by passing the resolution and the clause the nation has conformed to its creed, and risen in the estimation of the world, as it would have denied its creed and lost in the world's estimation, if it had refused to condemn the bomb outrage and perform the common courtesy of recognising the good even in a representative of a rule which we seek to destroy.

To the constructive program the Congress has added boycott of legislatures. This was in my opinion inevitable. Those who would have Independence have to work outside the legislatures and among the people. That no single seat will remain vacant because of Congressmen withdrawing from the legislatures is no reason for opposing the boycott. Let those who believe in the legislatures by all means go there. It is enough that Congressmen employ themselves otherwise and cease to give these bodies any prestige through their presence there. For me the decisive opinion of Pandit Motilalji in favor of boycott was enough to incorporate it in the resolution.

The program would have been undoubtedly strengthened if law courts and Government schools were also boycotted. But the atmosphere was absent. The Congress is not an organization to enunciate theories, but to anticipate national wants and wishes, and forge practical sanctions for their fulfilment.

Local bodies stand on a different footing. They were included in the original draft. But as opinion was sharply divided, I did not press for their retention in the boycott clause. Let no one however run away with the idea that it is now any Congressman's duty to seek election to or capture these institutions. On the contrary it is the duty of every Congressman to retire from or avoid them, if they take away best workers'

attention from better work or if they mean continuous wrangling, dissensions or worse. They are at liberty to remain in them or seek election thereto when they are convinced that by their presence there, they can promote not merely some legitimate interest but national independence.

The greatest and the most effective sanction however is civil disobedience including non-payment of taxes. Whilst the task of choosing the time and the method of it has been nominally and properly left to the All-India Congress Committee to decide, I know that it is a duty primarily devolving upon me. I must confess that I do not see the atmosphere for it today. I want to discover a formula whereby sufficient provision can be made for avoiding suspension by reason of Chauri Chaura. A time must come when there may be a fight to the finish with one's back to the wall. With the present temper of many Congressmen, with our internal dissensions, with the communal tension, it is difficult to discover an effective and innocent formula. It may be impossible to offer civil disobedience at this stage in the name of the Congress, and it may be necessary to offer individual civil disobedience without the Congress imprimatur and apart from it. But just now everything is in the embryonic state. I can only give the impatient patriot the assurance, that I am concentrating all my powers on discovering a workable formula. He can help me materially by assisting to promote a nonviolent atmosphere and to push forward the constructive program. I know that many have refused to see any connection between the constructive program and civil disobedience. But for one who believes in non-violence it does not need hard thinking to realize the essential connection between the constructive program and civil disobedience *for Swaraj*. I want the reader to mark the qualification. Constructive program is not essential for local civil disobedience for specific relief as in the case of Bardoli. Tangible common grievance restricted to a particular locality is enough. But for such an indefinable thing as Swaraj people must have previous training in doing things of all-India interest. Such work must throw together the people and their leaders whom they would trust implicitly. Trust begotten in the pursuit of continuous constructive work becomes a tremendous asset at the critical moment. Constructive work therefore is for a non-violent army what drilling etc. is for an army designed for bloody warfare. Individual civil disobedience among an unprepared people and by leaders not known to or trusted by them is of no avail, and mass civil disobedience is an impossibility. The more therefore the progress of the constructive program, the greater is there the chance for civil disobedience. Granted a perfectly non-violent atmosphere and a fulfilled constructive program, I would undertake to lead a mass civil disobedience struggle to a successful issue in the space of a few months.

Whilst thus the central resolution lays down the country's objective and the methods for its attainment in no uncertain terms, it does not rule out the idea of a conference in every circumstance. It merely and most properly says, that "in the existing circumstances" no good purpose can be served by the Congress being represented at the proposed conference. What are then the conceivable circumstances in which the Congress may be represented at such a conference? I can mention at least one such circumstance. If the British Government invites the Congress to a conference, that is to discuss and frame not any scheme, but a scheme definitely of Independent Government, and fulfills the other conditions suitable for such a conference, I take it that the Congress leaders will gladly respond. Indeed a conference there must be at some stage or other. It can take place as the proposed conference was expected to take place out of Britain's good grace and pressure of world opinion, or out of pressure from us as we hope it will be if we develop sufficient strength. Whether such a time is to be far or near depends upon how we utilize or waste this year of grace.

Next in importance and almost part of the central resolution must be deemed the one dealing with our financial obligations. Every one who knows anything of public finance knows how extravagant this Government is and how heavy is the load of debts that is crushing the nation. Every one knows also what concessions have been given to foreigners in utter disregard of the national interest. These cannot demand, dare not expect recognition from Independent India under the much abused name of vested interests. All vested interests are not entitled to protection. The keeper of a gambling den or of a brothel has no vested interest. Nor has a corporation that gambles away the fortunes of a nation and reduces it to impotence. The Congress at Gaya therefore passed a comprehensive resolution repudiating certain debts. The last, whilst reaffirming the Gaya resolution, laid down that obligations or concessions pronounced to be unjust and unjustifiable by an independent tribunal shall not be recognized by the Independence Government to come. No exception can, in my opinion, be possibly taken against such a reasonable proposition. To shirk the issue is to invite disaster.

Equally important is the communal resolution. Though it was adopted for the sake of the Sikhs, it was necessary otherwise too to enunciate the principle underlying it. Independent India cannot afford to have communal representation, and yet it must placate all communities if the rule of Independence is not based on coercion of minorities. But the Congress has now to cultivate a spirit of common nationality and refuse to resort to camouflage or expedience in a matter so vital as the communal question. In the Congress we must cease to be exclusive Hindus or Musalmans or Sikhs, Parsis, Christians, Jews. Whilst we may staunchly adhere to our respective faiths, we must be in the Congress Indians first and Indians last. A good Hindu or a good Musalman should be a better Hindu or a better Musalman for being a lover of his country. There never can be any conflict between the real interest of one's country antd that of one's religion. Where there appears to be any, there is something wrong with one's religion, i. e., one's morals. True religion means good thought and good conduct. True patriotism also means good thought and good conduct. To set up a comparison between two synonymous things is wrong. But if Congress is ever forced to consider a solution based on communalism, the resolution binds it to reject any that does not satisfy the parties concerned. In order however that the Congress may never be faced with a situation demanding a communal solution, it should now be joined in large numbers by Musalmans, Sikhs and others who will have India as one indivisible nation. I for one would welcome the Congress passing into Musalman, Sikh, Parsi, Christian, Jewish hands rather than that it should be in any sense a sectional organization. Any one who has the spirit of service

in him can capture the Congress. It has the most democratic franchise. Its doors are ever open to those who would serve. Let all join it and make it a mighty instrument for gaining complete independence for the poorest, the weakest and the most downtrodden. —*M. K. Gandhi.*

Humanism—A Statement

The most significant tendency of modern religion is its inevitable trend toward Humanism. Inevitable, because man cannot endure the mental unbalance of retaining magic in his religion when he has banished it from all other departments of his life. When man removed magic from alchemy and studied the laws of the elements, chemistry was born. When he eliminated divination from astrology and learned the laws of the stars, astronomy rapidly developed as a science. And when he dares to exorcise the supernatural from religion and study the phenomena and laws of religious experience, similar progress will be made in that sphere.

Most unscientifically, theology the so-called "queen of the sciences," has begun with the unknown, has assumed the existence and attributes of God, and has thus based its whole structure on a supposition.

The new science of religion begins with the known phenomena, namely, the religious experience of men, and works toward the unknown.

The humanizing of religion has been postponed far too long, but there has been a reason for the delay. People have dreaded the very radical changes they knew would be necessary.

Humanism isn't simply another denomination of Protestant Christianity: it isn't a creed; nor is it a cult. It is a new type of religion altogether. It is a new way of looking at religion. You have to make over and broaden your definition of religion to get Humanism in at all. The humanist splits the seams of all the old coats of religion when he tries them on. The new wine has burst the old wineskins.

Apparently there has been a suddenness in the advent of Humanism. A few months ago one heard of it only in a very limited circle; today the newspapers and magazines are full of it. But the suddenness is only apparent. Humanism has been for some time quietly growing in the minds of a few, waiting until the spread of scientific knowledge should prepare the way for its appearing. Persons familiar with trends in religious thought have for years sensed some mighty change impending. The revolution in religion they foresaw is here.

By revolution in religion we do not mean mere reforms in religions, such as the reinterpreting of the cardinal tenets of orthodox Christianity in the light of modern thought, or the socializing of the religions which were formerly concerned only with the salvation of the individual. Nor do we mean the Back to Jesus and Back to Buddha movements, nor the higher criticism of Bible, Koran, or Vedas.

These were but preparations for the revolution, shadows cast by the coming event. The revolution is nothing less than the complete revaluation of religion itself on a humanistic basis rather than a supernatural one. This revaluation is producing a religion so different in type from its predecessors that some critics claim that it is no religion at all. And many people whose knowledge of science has made them humanists have left the churches thinking themselves no longer religious, when their very humanism is itself a new religion.

There are sixty million people in the United States alone who are not on the lists of adherents of any religious organization, whether church, synagog, or society. These sixty millions are not to be reckoned as not desiring any religion. It is probable that most of them are simply dissatisfied with the religions they have known, the religions which emphasize the supernatural. To these people who are seeking a satisfactory religion for today Humanism comes as something long sought and almost despaired of. The letter-files of Humanist preachers are growing plethoric with correspondents' expressions of delight at having found "at last a religion one can believe and live by," "a common sense religion for today," and "an inspiring faith for modern folk."

Humanism is still very young, but its adherents exhibit the enthusiasm which characterizes the rise of a new religion. And there is a sanity and wholesomeness about it which renders its followers immune to the fanatic excesses which have been exhibited in some religions.

From California to New York, and even in India and Japan, Humanist groups are in process of formation, and every week brings fresh news of the growth of the new movement.

Not all these groups agree in all details of belief and practice, but certain common elements appear. One notices in all of them, naturally, an emphasis on the value of sincerity and a corresponding scorn of hypocrisy. They all stress the importance of living the good life here and now, rather than worrying much about what is to come afterward. They repeat frequently the need of self-development by the individual and lay equal emphasis on social cooperation and a sense of social responsibility. They find inspiration in contemplating the upward sweep of evolution and the noble lives of the great heroes of human progress. The point upon which they are unanimous and most insistent is the rejection of belief in the supernatural, which belief they seem to consider not only of no value in religion, but even detrimental to progress in religion.

It is because Humanists reject the supernatural that many maintain that Humanism cannot be a religion at all. Certainly if you assert that religion is the worship of the supernatural, then Humanism is not a religion. But religion is wider than supernaturalism. As scientists who specialize in studying the phenomena of religion are pointing out, there are wide areas of religion where the supernatural does not enter at all.

Philosophy was once largely metaphysics, but the metaphysical element has been left to one side in several recent systems of philosophy. In fact, there are wide areas in philosophy where metaphysics does not enter at all. It is just as inaccurate to say that religion without the supernatural is not religion as it is to say

that philosophy without metaphysics is not philosophy at all.

Recent definitions of religion by expert students of religion are much broader than those formerly taught. Contrast Allan Menzies' definition in his History of Religion (1895), "Religion is the worship of higher powers from a sense of need" with that of E. S. Ames in The Psychology of Religious Experience (1910), "Religion is the consciousness of the highest social values."

Or take Immanuel Kant's famous definition in his Critique of Practical Reason (1788), "Religion is the recognition of all duties as divine commands" and compare it with A. Eustace Haydon's in The Quest of the Ages (1929), "Religion is the shared quest of the good life."

According to Kant and Menzies, representatives of the older type of thought, Humanism would hardly be called a religion, but under the definitions of Ames and Haydon it certainly would.

Religion is the attempt to unify one's personality and relate it to the world without. Hitherto men have thought that this process necessarily involved the worship and propitiation of certain supernatural beings, but the advance of science has made such a belief seem rather naive, almost childish.

The really revolutionary character of Humanism is best seen when one realizes that Humanists not only do not consider belief in the supernatural necessary in religion, but even hold that today such a belief may defeat the purpose of religion. For if religion seeks to unify the personality and relate it to the world without, any belief which hinders either part of the process is detrimental.

Now a belief in supernatural beings is quite foreign to the modern man's understanding of the scheme of things. His knowledge of science prevents him from finding any room in the world outside himself or the world of personality within himself for either gods or demons. Such beings simply cannot exist for him, in the sense in which they existed for the men of the prescientific age.

In Bible times, men could believe in gods and demons: they knew no better way of explaining certain phenomena. Jesus believed that the way the earth and man came into being was by direct creation by the hand of Jehovah. He believed that disease was due to demon-possession. He believed that wrong thoughts were whisperings of Satan. He believed that good thoughts and good deeds were due to the presence of God or the Holy Spirit within him.

The man of the twentieth century who is familiar with even the commonplaces of scientific truth classifies all the creation stories, whether in Hebrew literature or in the lore of the South Sea Islands, as primitive myths. He accepts evolution as the method by which the earth and man arrived at their present state. He knows that disease is due to germs: he has seen them through a high-school microscope. And he knows that it is just as inaccurate to ascribe his good thoughts, aspirations, and actions to a god as it is to blame the devil for his bad thoughts and deeds.

Such primitive ideas do not aid a man when he seeks today to get a unified view of his life and his relations to others and to nature. They only confuse him and defeat his highest purposes. He cannot reconcile an ancient religion with his modern life.

And when some earnest theist informs him that if he does not believe in the supernatural, he can have no religion, he decides that he must give up religion in order to preserve his intellectual and emotional and moral integrity.

With the coming of Humanism, however, the modern man finds a religion which does fit in with his scheme of things. Not that he welcomes it as an easy let-down in his standards, permitting him to take a moral vacation and to do as he pleases. Far from it, for while Humanism is easier to understand and believe, it is harder to live by, for it requires more personal consecration and devotion to the highest ideals and a deeper sense of social responsibility than does orthodox religion.

Long ago, centuries before Christ, when philosophic humanism had developed in the magnificent Greek civilization, Socrates counselled every man he met: "Know thyself." In the intervening centuries, however, man has exerted his powers mainly to discover the world outside. Only recently has he turned his instruments upon himself. In years to come, the twentieth century will probably be known as the era of the discovery of human personality.

Recent researches in psychology have also prepared the way for the coming of Humanism, a positive constructive religion built upon man's faith in his own powers. If Humanists were to make a creed, the first article would be: "I believe in Man."

To some, such a statement sounds sacrilegious, because they have for so long been accustomed to the idea of the Fall of Man and his inherent depravity, and have repeated so many times the false aphorism: "Human nature never changes." They have thus created in their own minds a barrier to belief in the limitless possibilities of mankind.

There is good scientific justification for believing that man is really just beginning his career upon this earth and that a million years or more of development, mentally, morally, and spiritually, lie before him. What may not be accomplished if man dares to believe in his own future and to take his vast responsibilities to those who come after him more seriously than has been possible when religion has centered his attention on "otherworldliness"!

Man's recent accomplishments, however, in the spheres of radio communication and the conquest of the air, have gone far to create in him a confidence in his own latent powers.

It becomes immediately apparent that the chief concern of Humanism is to release the pent up reservoir of human energy, to explore the uncharted territory of the mind, and to raise to its highest efficiency the entire personality.

Therefore Humanists are not only opposed to all movements, institutions and practices, however religiously sanctioned, which tend to cramp and confine the human personality and to prevent its proper development, but they are also actively engaged in helping those movements which tend to release, develop and expand the life of man.

CHARLES FRANCIS POTTER.

The Study Table

Whither Mankind

No one unacquainted with the facts would suppose upon reading this book* that Professor Ellwood's previous works have been the object of bitter attacks on the part of orthodox religionists. Though based upon broad and sound scientific principles, Dr. Ellwood's books are all informed with what is known as "the Christian outlook and the spirit of the Gospels:" so much so, that many serious students of the origins of Christianity and the early history of the Church might be inclined to lay down "Man's Social Destiny" as, *a priori,* based upon erroneous premises, and hence not worth reading.

This would, however, be a lamentable mistake; for the book is, on the whole, one of the most important contributions to the very interesting question, Whither Mankind? that has appeared recently. It is replete, like all the previous works by the professor of sociology at the University of Missouri, with clear-cut statements of the utmost value to Christians and non-Christians alike. Both in his analysis of present-day trends and in his constructive criticisms, Professor Ellwood penetrates to the very heart of the various social and political problems now crying for solution. It would be fortunate if every publicist, legislator, editor, and clergyman in this republic were to read this stimulating and informative study with an open mind and a desire to put into practice some of its principles that are obviously valid and illuminating.

Dr. Ellwood does not present a Pollyannish optimism. In his earlier works he was rated as more or less of a pessimist, simply because he dared to point out to the complacent certain glaring evils and dangers inherent in the generally accepted social and political viewpoint, and in the general attitude of leaders in the Church. But he does not and did not suggest that these evils were inevitable or irremediable. On the contrary, he has pointed out how they might be reduced to a minimum, or, some of them, entirely eliminated. His position was and is that evils must first be clearly recognized before any remedy will be either sought or applied. Diagnosis must precede either surgery or therapeutic treatment, in the body politic as well as in the hospital.

And so the first chapter of his latest study of world social conditions deals with "The Present Social Pessimism," indicating its widespread prevalence and the underlying causes which bring the dissatisfaction, disillusionment, and cynicism to the surface. The other side of the shield is presented in the chapter following, "The Resources of Mankind," one of the most heartening and soundly optimistic contributions that has ever come within my purview. Some philanthropist should have this chapter published separately and give it a nation-wide distribution as a needed corrective and antidote to a narrow and morbid outlook.

While the appeal of "Man's Social Destiny" is mostly to readers who accept the liberal Christian viewpoint, it has much in it of value to readers who would not be in sympathy with some of its basic assumptions. It is unfortunate that some of its most sympathetic readers will be antagonized by an attitude on the part of the author toward the Russian experiment that is obviously based on a lack of accurate information. Even so qualified, however, the book has much in it that is stimulating and highly useful to any thoughtful student of the problems presented. MAYNARD SHIPLEY.

*Man's Social Destiny in the Light of Science. By Charles A. Ellwood, Ph.D., L.L.D. Nashville, Tenn., Cokesbury Press. $2.00.

Significant Anthologies

The average poet today shuts himself aloof and closes his eyes to the seething panorama of human anguish and endeavor. Rarely do we find among our introspective contemporary singers a poet who lives up to Shelley's magnificent declaration that "poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world." It is therefore a gratifying experience to discover the Rebel Poets, the Internationale of Song, a fellowship of poets pledged to support the forces working for world peace and for a more equitable economic system. They have just issued their first annual anthology, "Unrest,"[1] edited by Jack Conroy and Ralph Cheyney, founder of the Rebel Poets.

In these pages we rejoice to find the dean of American poets, William Ellery Leonard, whose "Two Lives" and poems of protest are among the finest poetic contributions of our age. We also find such excellent and eminent poets as Giovannitti, Michael Gold, E. Merrill Root, James Rorty and Robert Whitaker, so well known to readers of UNITY. Among the more recent voices deserving particular comment are F. A. Dewson, Marion Doyle, Nicholas Moskowitz and Arthur Truman Merrill. The editors are themselves represented with significant poems.

The economic and political philosophies of the poets represented differ widely but are unified by the spirit of unrest and the exultant determination to bring about a new and finer civilization. In these days of factional discord which so cruelly retards the march of progress it is splendid to discover a group which ignores minor differences and pledges itself to fundamentals of revolt. There are a few weak verses but on the whole this collection is a fine achievement that should encourage many poets to keep the drums of courage beating.

"Poems of Justice,"[2] compiled by Thomas Curtis Clark, to which Zona Gale has written a brilliant and sensitive foreword, is another anthology in much the same vein of social justice. It also inspires our warm admiration. The compiler should be congratulated on his astonishingly wide scope of material which includes selections ranging from Euripides and Isaiah down to the work of contributors to recent pages of UNITY.

Here are many stirring poems, many heroic utterances which have fired the imagination of humanity through generations. Thomas Hood's haunting "Song of the Shirt," Shelley's "Song to the Men of England" and many other famous poems shed their ageless magic upon these pages. Many contemporary voices speak with equal eloquence. Ralph Chaplin, Louis Ginsberg, Angela Morgan, James Oppenheim, Anna Louise Strong, Charles Erskine Scott Wood, Sara Bard Field and Ralph Cheyney are a few of these voices undoubtedly familiar to our readers. Mr. Clark himself is represented with poems the radiant

1. "Unrest," edited by Jack Conroy and Ralph Cheyney, Stockwell, Ltd., London, England. American agent, Hugh Hanley, 224 West Pacemont Road, Columbus, Ohio. $1.00.
2. "Poems for Justice," compiled by Thomas Curtis Clark. Willett, Clark and Colby, Chicago, Ill. $2.50.

and sensitive spirit of which proclaim him a poet well qualified for the splendid task he has admirably achieved.

We regret the absence of William Ellery Leonard, Arturo Giovannitti, Clement Wood and E. Merrill Root whose vigorous work we feel would have given added lustre to this collection. But why complain of omissions in the presence of such wealth of courage, vigor and inspiration in the age-old struggle for social justice?

These two books with Marcus Graham's "Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry" are a trinity of volumes published in 1929 which give a prophetic indication of the social awakening of our age. These volumes may receive scant recognition today amid the blare of blurbs touting the popular and the egocentric, but we believe they will endure and achieve recognition in future decades as among the year's few real contributions to culture. They prove that the poet is not always the idle, self-conscious dreamer he is usually pictured but a potent force for the emancipation of human life.

LUCIA TRENT.

Correspondence

A Friend With a Mind of Her Own

Editor of UNITY:

Your editorial paragraphs are very disappointing at times, notably your going over to Hoover as a great president and still contending that Alfred E. Smith was the worst beaten candidate in presidential history, when you know that he had the largest vote ever cast for a Democratic ticket. Had it not been for religious bigotry and conventional snobbery, Smith would be in the place of the smug Quaker, Hoover. I understand there are two kinds of Quakers, and that Hoover is not of the Hickite variety. From my point of view his administration so far has not redeemed one of his campaign promises. Boulder Dam, practically given over to the power trust; farm relief still nebulous; and last but not least, the Kellogg Pact, which so far as I can see now is pure bluff.

Then I do not think the enforcement of the "noble experiment" is anything to be proud of. The 18th Amendment can no more be enforced nationally than the 14th and 15th Amendments in the South. It surprises me that an intelligent man, as I think you are, cannot see this. There are always laws made to be broken, as every successful revolt from tyranny has proved since the world began.

You may publish this if you thing it advisable. I think your readers should know of disapproving critics as well as of those who only write to praise.

AGNES C. WATSON.

St. Petersburg, Fla.

India, Britain, and the Present Crisis

Editor of UNITY:

It is true that India's foreign rulers make "troubled waters," and exacerbate the relations among the Indian people. But to say, as Grace Gilman says, that there are no "festering sores" in India, is to refuse to look reality in the face. Differences there are, and they are not the creation of British machination. They are a part and parcel of India's heritage, and have determined the course of her historical development. The deep-seated hostility between the Hindu and the Muslim existed long before Vasco Da Gama (1498) set his foot on Indian soil, or Queen Elizabeth (1600) granted a charter to the East India Company. What the British have done and do is to accentuate those differences and exploit them to their fullest advantage.

It must be remembered that the British are absolutely justified in fomenting divisions and strife among the Indian people in order to secure the safety of their rule. They have conquered India, not for the benefit of the Indians, but for their own benefit. They have shed their precious blood on the battlefields of Hindustan not to reclaim the Indians from Asiatic superstitions or to teach them the art of government, but to secure a market for the surplus goods of Great Britain and to enrich the English nation. Self-interest guides the conduct of individuals as well as of nations, and the English are no exception to the rule. If they suck India dry they are simply acting according to the accepted morality of superior nations and the ethics of nature. Other colonial nations have been no better than the British in their treatment of their inferiors and did not hesitate to reduce them to the condition of servitude and slavery. The Portuguese in the East Indies and the Spaniards in the West Indies perpetrated indescribable horrors on their victims and made hecatombs of races and civilizations. The British are simply following in the footsteps of their predecessors, and if they have made and make India their El Dorado they cannot justifiably be blamed. Nature herself is red in tooth and claw, and knows nothing about sympathy, equality, justice, human brotherhood, and the like. She knows only force. In her realm the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong, and those who are unable to assert themselves must suffer iniquities from their superiors and must go to the wall. The big and intelligent swallow the small and less intelligent and there is no question of mercy and justice. Those Indian politicians who denounce the British for the exploitation of their country are poor students of history and ignorant of the ways of nature. They simply make themselves a laughing-stock of the world when they ask a change of heart from their white rulers and to confer upon them the blessings of self-government. The British are not going to relinquish their imperial privileges and to cease to impoverish India by humble petitions and by mere threats. Lord Salisbury is the final word on the relations between India and England, when he says, "India must be bled, and bled judiciously," and Indian patriots will do well to refuse to believe in high-sounding and hypocritical promises of British statesmen.

I am somewhat inclined to believe with Grace Gilman that the trouble with India is religions. It is true that modern India is cursed with too many religions which divide her people into endless gradations, castes, creeds, and denominations, and seriously vitiate her national character. It is very painful to note that all the phantoms of human weakness and superstition have selected India their home, while all the good things of life and human utility have made their abode in the countries of the West. Thus Brahma, Allah, Ahuramazda, Wahguru, Heavenly Father, and what not, condemn Aryabharata to weakness and slavery, while patriotism, science, politics, trade, and industry make Europe and America the supreme masters of the riches of the earth and put the destinies of weaker states in the palm of their hands.

We must not overlook, however, the historical fact that religion, and not religions, is responsible for India's present political subjection and her inferior place in the world. All religions, with the sole exception of Buddhism, are after all only one and the same thing. If there are differences in their observances and rites they are simply conditioned by climatic factors, economic conditions, peculiarities of race, and the like. It was religion that brought about the downfall of India and put her at the mercy of the foreigner. The craze of the Indian mind for immateriality caused the Indians to abandon their domestic relations and to resign themselves to the will of God. In their absurd longing for the supernatural the Indians lost their country and fell under the domination of alien races and civilizations. While they were torturing themselves, practicing horrible austerities, inflicting unspeakable cruelties on their tender bodies in quest of the creation of their imagination and fear, their country was overrun by the foreign freebooters and put to fire and the sword. They were not inferior to any nation in military virtues, valor, and intellect, and might have been one of the strongest nations if they had not misguided their energies. But the idea of that foolishness so-called union with the divine took complete possession of their minds and they sacrificed their secular ends at the altar of supposed heavenly blessings.

With me it is an article of faith that as long as there in religion in India, to talk of an Indian nation is utter

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS AT ROCKFORD

The Annual Meeting and a Regional Conference of the National Federation of Religious Liberals were held Monday and Tuesday, February 17th and 18th, in the Church of the Christian Union, Rockford, Ill., the Reverend Charles Parker Connolly, minister. The visitors greatly enjoyed the fellowship with Mr. Connolly and his people, who exhibited the soul of kindliness in their hospitality.

Inasmuch as the quadrennial meeting for the election of members of the commission of the Federation did not fall this year (it is due in 1931), the business meeting was occupied only with routine business, with Roger S. Galer, LL.D., of Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, the president, in the chair. The program opened Monday evening, with Mr. Connolly presiding. The first speaker was Dr. Galer, who took as his subject, "The Place of a Liberal Faith in a Modern World." Dr. Galer took as his starting point the dictum of Francis Bacon concerning the "pleasure of standing on the vantage ground of truth." Truth as it has been newly revealed has vastly dislocated all of the old conceptions of the universe, of social relations, and of authority, but religion still has the office of ascertaining and publishing a reason for existence. Any system of religious teaching or of religious organization must justify itself by the vigor with which it can interpret probabilities in human life and by the influence it can have in establishing social values. It is the job of liberal religion to culture in character a philosophy, a viewpoint, an attitude toward life, that will in turn cultivate a code of morals in harmony with the very constitution of the universe; and it is the further appointment of liberal religion to press forward to the total abolition of poverty without withdrawing the stern necessity upon men to work.

The second speaker at the Monday evening session was the Reverend Julius F. Krolfifer of the First Unitarian Church of Davenport, Ia. Mr. Krolfifer spoke on "Unity with Freedom," and he developed the thesis of unity in the spirit as the soul of the liberal church bodies. The problem of our modern society is to lead men to unify their actions freely and gladly in the common activities and to preserve at the same time their spiritual and mental individuality. Liberalism is trying to show the world how this may be done, with our organizations made up of many minds, many opinions, united in a unity of the spirit, kept dynamic for growth, and held together by confidence in the sincerity of our fellows and by a sense of our kinship in purpose.

The Tuesday morning session was devoted to a round table on the subject, "Trends in Philanthropic Giving and the Responsibility of the church," led by Prof. Jordan Cavan of Rockford College. Dr. Cavan laid down the thesis that since the very general passing of education and philanthropy from church control to public control by taxation or by large community effort, it seems that many persons are not giving so much as their church-motivated fathers. A serious problem results in that new demands are constantly arising with no one ready to meet them, for example, tuberculosis has been met most successfully in a warfare first financed by private philanthropy and then taken up by the state, but cancer, cardiac diseases, nerve and brain troubles are taking dread toll beyond the ravages of tuberculosis and no one is coming forward with the sinews of war against them. The church has been the mother of philanthropy and there is still much need for its leadership.

The visitors in attendance at the meeting lunched with the Rockford Kiwanis Club, which meets regularly in the parish room of the entertaining church. The speaker was Dr. Charles E. Snyder of Sioux City, executive chairman of the Federation, whose subject was "Things that Have Interested Me."

Another round table was held in the afternoon, with Prof. C. Walker Hayes of Rockford College as leader, on the subject, "Personality and the Group." He gave several approaches to working definitions of personality and of society, and suggested that personality cannot be considered apart from the group. A personality is bound to have interests antagonistic to the group interests, and the office of religion is to substitute for the physical stimuli which are likely to make trouble, cultural stimuli which tend to control primitive impulses and to work for the group interests.

The Tuesday evening session was devoted to addresses by Dr. Horace Bridges of the Chicago Ethical Society and by Rabbi Felix A. Levy of Emanuel Congregation, of Chicago. Dr. Bridges discussed "The Gospel of Humanism According to Mr. Walter Lippmann." He paid high compliment to Mr. Lippmann as a man of true insight into deep spiritual problems, and of a vigor of understanding hewn from life. He emphasized the values of certain chapters in Mr. Lippmann's book, and then vigorously challenged Mr. Lippmann's conclusions in which he tries to establish a philosophy of ethics without having made the study of ethics a specialty. "In 1917 Dr. Felix Adler wrote a book to which Mr. Lippmann has now written a preface."

Rabbi Levy took as his subject "The Religion of a Modern Man." He deprecated the ease with which so many children are receiving the opportuni-

---

nonsense. But I am glad to note that modern forces in India are working to bring about the dissolution of religion and to loosen the old bonds of custom and tradition. The impact of modern civilization is pressing upon the old and conservative Indian world-order with irresistible fury and is bursting asunder the firm joints of caste and ancient moorings. It is liable to go down before the great world movements that are convulsing Asia, Europe, the coasts of Africa, and the islands of the sea, and shaking India to the center. The new ideas are dynamite that shatters the steel ramparts of religious obscurantism and shivers the thick ice of inveterate prejudice and superstition. The crusade of Russia, China, and Turkey against this colossal Asiatic barbarism will have strong repercussion and will exercise a beneficent influence on the Indian situation. More is being done for Indian liberation at Moscow, Canton, and Angora than at Calcutta, Lahore, and Bombay. In India behind the savage communal riots and the noisier agitations, there silently stalks a force that is destined to shake the whole fabric of Indian society. India indeed is standing unconscious, as France stood in the second-half of the eighteenth century, on the brink of a crater which is destined to change profoundly by its eruption the whole course of her historical development and civilization. And when that explosion occurs it will be the most glorious day in the history of India and the East.

Finally, it was not my intention to disparage or belittle the achievements of Mahatma Gandhi, or to question his sincerity. He is one of the most remarkable men India has produced. His purity of life, simplicity of manners, reckless courage, and devotion to his country are an example to his countrymen. But Mahatma's ways are not the ways of the world, and his gospel of love and *ahimsa* have no place in world politics. Ghandi's mystical idealism is not applicable to the twentieth century politics and will not redeem India from the yoke of the foreigner.

DALJIT SINGH SADHARIA.

Garfield, Utah.

Correction and Explanation

Editor of UNITY: I observe that you have been printing my report letters from various countries. In your issue of Oct. 21, 1929, you have made a mistake on page 72 regarding the visit of our party to Einstein. I wrote: "We had the privilege of meeting Einstein. We motored out for an hour and he came in from the country to meet us." In your editing of my article you have changed each use of the word "we" which represents the party, to the word "I" and then placed before it the article by Professor Jesse Holmes who was in the party. Your changes, which I am sure were inadvertent, make it appear that my statement ignored the party and monopolized the interview. Einstein did not motor in to meet me but the party. I would be grateful if you will make this correction in your columns.

Lahore, India

SHERWOOD EDDY

[We beg to apologize to Dr. Eddy, and to express our regret that this editorial revision did him the injustice indicated. Our motive was good, but our insight abominable. —Editor]

ties for which their fathers have had to work. He laid down three requisites of a valid religion, that it must be thoughtful and must make the necessary synthesis between the world of knowledge and the world of unseen values, that it must establish the reality of the Good Life and that it must be the champion of the democracy of man.

CHARLES E. SNYDER.
Executive Chairman.

AMERICAN BUSINESS MEN'S PROHIBITION FOUNDATION

America has constitutional prohibition. The Eighteenth, or Prohibition Amendment to the Federal Constitution, was submitted to the states by an overwhelming vote in Congress December 18, 1917. Forty-five states ratified the amendment by large majorities in their legislatures. The Secretary of State proclaimed it in effect on January 16, 1920. It is the permanent law of the nation and has been such for more than ten years.

National Prohibition, however, is in danger. By a flood of propaganda its antagonists are attempting to create open defiance to the law with a subsequent nullification of the effectiveness of this constitutional provision. This is the only danger, since its enemies cannot hope for its repeal. Any delay in the acceptance of this law by a portion of the American people causes a loss to all forms of industry.

There is need of an organization which will center its entire activities upon the one object of procuring, correlating and disseminating the facts concerning the public health, welfare and economic progress in this country resultant from the Eighteenth Amendment. To get at the facts and present this information to the people is the mission of the American Business Men's Foundation.

To do this job a national survey is being undertaken. Facts overshadow propaganda when adequately prepared, promptly presented and widely distributed. Through such an agency, making available facts concerning changed conditions due to prohibition, we can expose the fallacies of the opponents of the law. Such action would change the tone of the nation's press from indifference and opposition to open-mindedness and thoughtful consideration. Public opinion thus molded will be a powerful factor in creating an intelligent support of the law and conserving the benefits of Prohibition.

It is the purpose of the Foundation to present to all classes of the nation a comprehensive survey of the impartial economic facts of prohibition. Such pertinent material will make it possible for the American public to draw its own conclusions.

The survey proposes to assemble information from executives of individual corporations analyzing the effect on their communities and upon the development of their industries brought about by prohibition.

The Foundation fortunately has at its command wide avenues of publicity covering the country. This advantageous arrangement provides a comprehensive service through the nation's daily and weekly press and monthly publications which assures outstanding results.

The Foundation's activities are directed by a board of directors representing the trustees and working in counsel and co-operation with an advisory board, made up of distinguished leaders of education, science and industry.

The measure of the Foundation's influence and usefulness will be governed by the financial support accorded by those convinced that prohibition is a success.

The American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation is located at Seven South Dearborn Street, Chicago.

A Timely New Book

PALESTINE

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Dr. Stephen S. Wise says: "It is the most understanding book that has been written about Palestine." It is also a most revealing book, based on a recent journey through Palestine and written largely since the recent riots between Jews and Arabs. The Zionist movement in all its aspects is graphically surveyed. You will finish this unusual exposition with a new understanding of Palestine and its problems.

Just Published by THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Price $2.50

Order from UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

MARCH

The expectant feeling of Spring is in the air. It's high time to get ready the new season's apparel—to start the big home cleaning. Therefore we suggest the cleansing of both garments and home furnishings by our process of continuous clarification—the most efficient possible.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue